

## **II. AMENDMENT OF THE CLAIMS**

**COMPLETE LIST OF CLAIMS THAT ARE OR HAVE BEEN BEFORE THE OFFICE  
AFTER ENTRANCE OF THE AMENDMENTS MADE HEREIN FOLLOW NEXT  
PAGE:**

**1. (CANCELLED)**

**2. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED)** The system of claim 17, wherein the vehicle is selected from the group consisting of: an automobile, a truck, a bus, a tractor, a crane, and a 2- or 3-wheel conveyance.

**3. (CANCELLED)**

**4. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED)** The system of claim 17, wherein the signal generated by the vehicle control system is generated in the form of:

Radio frequency;

WLAN IEEE 802.11x & 802.16x standards;

Blue tooth means; and

Infrared means.

**5. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED)** The system of claim 17, wherein the intelligent wireless device comprises at least one surveillance camera.

**6. (CURRENTLY AMENDED)** The system according to claim [[1]] 17, wherein the information defining said vehicle includes at least one of:

vehicle identification number;

vehicle registration information;

pollution emission information; and

past violation summons information.

7. **(PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED)** The system according to claim 17, wherein the system further comprises means for the device to transmit a unique identifier to the vehicle control system.

8. **(PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED)** The system according to claim 17, wherein the device further comprises a means to transmit information to the vehicle control system, so as to inform the operator of the vehicle that the vehicle is stationary/parked/idling in a metered zone.

9. **(CURRENTLY AMENDED)** The system according to claim 17, wherein the system further comprises in the intelligent wireless device:

a time-lapse recorder with sufficient amount of recording space; and

a shock/vibration/sound/impact sensor.

10. **(PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED)** The system according to claim 5, wherein a plurality of surveillance cameras are mounted facing in all four directions.

11. **(PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED)** The system of claim 17, wherein the wireless device detects at least one of:

a vibration; or

a sound.

12. **(PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED)** The system of claim 17, wherein the wireless monitoring device detects at least one of:

a shock; or

a collision.

13. **(PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED)** The system of claim 18, wherein the wireless device automatically monitors the volume and flow of traffic in said speed zone to help

co-ordinate traffic light sequencing for facilitating optimum traffic movement, without requiring human intervention.

**14. (CURRENTLY AMENDED)** [[A]] The system of Claim 17 further comprising [[for]] monitoring pollution produced by an identified idling vehicle, said system comprising:

an intelligent wireless device operatively configured and programmed to monitor emissions from a vehicle idling within a defined space, said device being capable to receive signals from a vehicle control system mounted in a vehicle operatively configured to generate automatically a signal defining information associated with said vehicle;

the intelligent wireless device being capable of timing the idling vehicle;

the intelligent wireless device being capable of automatically determining violations of a legal requirement regarding said vehicle emissions and being capable automatically issuing a summons to said vehicle control system in said defined space, without human intervention.

**15. (CANCELLED)**

**16. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED)** A method for reducing or obviating the utilization of human resources comprising: installing the system according to claim 19, in a parking meter; said system being operatively configured to function without human intervention.

**17. (CURRENTLY AMENDED)** A system for an automatic enforcement of parking regulations without human intervention, comprising:

an intelligent wireless device operatively configured and programmed to monitor a vehicle within a defined space, to receive signals from a vehicle control system, mounted in said vehicle, which is operatively configured to generate a signal containing information associated with said vehicle, said device being capable of determining

privileges or violations of a legal requirement regarding said vehicle, and being capable of automatically issuing a summons to said vehicle control system, without human intervention, the at least one violation being wirelessly assessed due to the vehicle idling in said defined space for a time exceeding a defined limit, and a parking fee is assessed for the exact time period of occupying said defined space with consideration of the violations and privileges.

18. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED) A system for an automatic regulation of vehicular traffic, comprising:

an intelligent wireless device operatively configured and programmed to monitor and communicate to a plurality of vehicles within a defined space, to receive signals from a vehicle control system, mounted in the vehicles, which is operatively configured to generate a signal containing information associated with the vehicles, said device being capable of automatically alerting and controlling vehicle speed as well as determining violations of a legal requirement regarding any of the vehicles, and automatically issuing a summons to said vehicle control system, without human intervention, of such a vehicle that has been monitored in a space defined as a speed controlled zone in violation of a legal requirement with respect to vehicles in said speed controlled zone.

19. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED) A system for obviating or at least reducing the utilization of human resources in monitoring a vehicle in a defined space, comprising deployment of the system according to Claim 17.

20. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED) A system for obviating or at least reducing the utilization of human resources in monitoring a vehicle in a defined space, comprising deployment of the system according to Claim 18.

21. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED) A system for obviating or at least reducing the utilization of human resources in monitoring a vehicle in a defined space, comprising deployment of the system according to Claim 14.

### **III. REMARKS**

#### **Format of this Response**

This response is submitted in compliance with the revised format for making amendments to the specification, claims and drawings officially adopted by the USPTO on July 30, 2003, and which is now reflected in 37 C.F.R. §1.121.

If a substitute specification is submitted herein, a clean form and marked-up version are included. Amendments to drawings, if any, are submitted in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.84 on replacement sheets as an attachment to this document (with an accompanying detailed explanation of all of the changes with respect to the drawings made in the remarks section of this amendment.

#### **Status of Claims :**

**Amendments of the claims are presented herein. Claims have been newly added. Claims have been canceled, without prejudice. Claims 2, 4-14, and 16-21 are submitted for reconsideration.**

#### **Statement with Respect to Scope of Amended and Non-Amended Claims**

Revisions to the claim set is made in order to streamline prosecution of this case in order to obtain early allowance of embodiments that are presently anticipated to be of commercial significance and in response to the Examiner's restriction requirement which has been made final in the Office Action, and are not made for a purpose of patentability. Any amendment, cancellation, withdrawal or addition made herein with respect to the claims should not be construed in any manner as indicating Applicant's surrender of any subject matter of the application, or surrender of any equivalent to any element asserted in one or more claims. Any narrowing which may be evinced with respect to subject matter covered by the claims as a whole, or by one or more claims of the appended claims whether amended, re-represented, or new, when compared to claims previously in the application, should not be interpreted as

indicating that the Applicant has generally disclaimed the territory between the original claimed subject matter and the amended claimed subject matter. Amended claims elements are to be construed to include substantial equivalents known to those of ordinary skill in the art. Applicant asserts that any amendments transacted herein are made without prejudice and reserve all rights to prosecute any canceled claims, and claim structures preceding any amendment to a particular claim, and other disclosed (but not presently claimed) embodiments in the application, in future continuation applications, divisional applications, continuation-in-part applications, continuing prosecution applications, requests for continuing examination, re-examination applications and any other application claiming priority to the present application.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC 112***

##### **The Examiner's Position:**

Claims 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because claim 6 currently depends on cancelled claim 1 and claim 9 currently depends on no claim. The following prior art consideration will treat claims 6 and 9 as being dependent on claim 17.

#### ***Claim Rejections -35 USC § 103***

Claims 2, 4-8, 10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katz (US 2002/0109610A1) in view of Bahar (US 2003/0132840A1).

Specifically, base claim 17 is rejected over the primary reference to Katz allegedly disclosing a system for an automatic enforcement of parking regulations without human intervention in view of the secondary reference to Bahar allegedly disclosing in the same art the automatic issuing of citation/summons via electronic e-mail ([0021]).

Therefore, in the Examiner's opinion it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to alternatively or additionally issuing an electronic summons to the vehicle control system (10) in Katz in the form of electronic e-mail as taught by Bahar so that the violator is informed of the violation and summons in a speedy and timely manner.

Further, the Examiner contends that combined Katz and Bahar render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 17, including of claim 2 directed to a vehicle con(11 of Katz), claim 4 (10 of Katz) in view of Bahr, claim 5 directed to a surveillance camera ([0061]), claim 6, to a vehicle identification number ([0043], [0064], [0065] and [0067] of Katz), claim 7 for the device to transmit a unique identifier to the vehicle control system (line 14 of [0064] of Katz), claim 8 for a means to transmit information to the vehicle control system so as to inform the operator of the vehicle that the vehicle is stationary/parked/idling in a metered zone (Figs. 1b-1c, lines 11-19 of [0064], lines 10-13 of [0018] of Katz), claim 10 as in claim 15, whereby a plurality of said at least one surveillance cameras mounted facing in all four directions in order to better survey the surrounding areas in the zone.

Claims 9, 11-12, 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Katz in view of Bahar and Fulcher et al. (US 6,505,774). Specifically, according to the Examiner claim 9 is allegedly obvious as in the subject matter of claim 17, wherein the system further comprises in the intelligent wireless device a time-lapse recorder with sufficient amount of recording space ([0068] of Katz); but admittedly not the claimed shock/vibration/sound/impact sensor.

However, the Examiner opines that the Fulcher et al. disclosure of a shock sensor on a violation detecting and ticketing meter system for a vehicle parking space in order to protect it



against theft/vandals (col. 12, lines 15-18) would have rendered it obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to include a shock sensor as taught by Fulcher et al. on the intelligent wireless device of Katz and Bahar in order to protect it against theft/vandals. Allegedly, combined Katz and Bahar would render obvious all of the claimed subject matter of claims 11-12 as in claim 17, plus the consideration of claim 9 in view of Fulcher et al. (shock and vibration are equivalent in this context), claims 16 and 19 are obvious as in claim 17, wherein the claimed obviating or at least reducing utilization of human resources is met by the automation of violation detection and electronic summons delivery such as the claimed parking meter (65 of Katz).

Claims 14 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Katz in view of Bahar, and further in view of Brusseaux et al. (US 6,104,299) and Bomar, Jr. (US 3,720,911).

Specifically, the Examiner combines Katz and Bahar allegedly rendering obvious all of the subject matter as in claim 17, except admittedly for the claimed monitoring pollution produced by the identified idling vehicle to issue a summons to said vehicle control system.

In particular, the Examiner opines that Brusseaux et al. discloses monitoring of vehicle pollution from a meter device (10,20) using sensors (13,23) detecting emissions from a vehicle within a defined space defined by the detection zone, and Bomar, Jr. further discloses issuance of a summons to a vehicle driver of detected emissions/pollution violation (col. 3, lines 19-29 and col. 10, lines 36-64), and claim 21, as in claim 14, wherein the claimed obviating or at least reducing utilization of human resources is allegedly met by the automation of violation detection and electronic summons delivery.

Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Kovach (US 2005/0088320A1) in view of Katz and Bahar. More particularly, the Examiner alleges that Kovach's system monitors speed in a defined space with automatic summons of combined Katz and Bahar to provide a convenient and automated way of delivering the summons to the violator, and claim 20 is allegedly obvious over all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 18, for obviating or at least reducing utilization of human resources is met by the automation of violation detection and electronic summons delivery.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kovach in view of Katz, Bahar and Lee (US pat. #6,710,722). In the Examiner's opinion, combined Kovach, Katz and Bahar render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 18, while Lee discloses the known monitoring of the volume and flow of traffic in a speed zone to help co-ordinate traffic light sequencing for facilitating optimum traffic movement without requiring human intervention (Abstract and Fig. 1).

In the Examiner's opinion, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine the wireless device that automatically monitors vehicle speed in Kovach, Katz and Bahar in a system such as taught by Lee to co-ordinate traffic light sequencing by monitoring the volume and flow of traffic, so as to provide the advantages of the combined features in a single system.

**Applicant's Response:**

Applicant disagrees. Claims 6 and 9 have been corrected according to the Examiner's

suggestions, and are deemed allowable.

The cited references taken alone or in combination , neither disclose nor suggest the claimed invention as amended. As presently amended in base claim 17, the instant system provides control over environmental pollution by limiting the idling time of a vehicle occupying the defined space as well as charging a fee only for the time a vehicle actually occupies the defined space (not a standard unit of time, use it or not). Claim 14 has been amended to depend from Claim 17 and to afford a means for timing the stay in said defined space while idling. Independent Claim 18 is directed to a completely automatic wireless system that is able to operate expressly devoid of human intervention and monitor/control vehicle speed as well as fine any excess thereof by communication with vehicle transceiver and the operator. In the first instance the combined references to Katz and Bahar do not reasonably predict the claimed wireless monitoring and controlling of parking and moving of the vehicle in a defined space or zone. Moreover, there is no reasonable hint as to how the instant total system comprises means for limiting vehicle speed and pollution in a defined space.

The rejection of claims 4, and 7-12 is deemed overcome in as much as the base claim 17 is advantageously distinct from the cited combined art for the reasons set forth above in response to the novelty rejections. A prima facie case has not been made since the references taken alone or in combination do not even remotely suggest the claimed invention. Therefore, the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103 is deemed improper and its withdrawal is solicited herewith.

## CONCLUSION

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. US 5895450 and US 20030055701 are directed to e-mail citations and electronic summons, respectively.

Applicant has reviewed these references that the Examiner cited but did not rely on. The references taken singly or combined neither disclose nor suggest the claimed invention. No further comments are deemed requisite at this time.

Applicant, therefore, requests that the rejection under the statutes be withdrawn, which favorable action is solicited. The application is now believed to be in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hans-Peter G. Hoffmann, PhD  
Reg. No. 37,352

KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP  
TWO STAMFORD PLAZA  
281 TRESSER BOULEVARD  
STAMFORD, CT 06901  
Phone 203-351-8011  
Fax: 203-327-2669

Dated: February 28, 2006

E-mail: [hhoffmann@kelleydrye.com](mailto:hhoffmann@kelleydrye.com)